1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITE	D STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	IN THE CHILD STITLES BISTAGE COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	LANITA DAVIS,	No. C 18-1121 WHA (PR)
10 11	Petitioner, v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS
12	DOLLING,	
13	Respondent.	
14	7	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	substances. For the reasons discussed below, respondent is ordered to show cause why the	
20		
21	STATEMENT	
22	Petitioner was convicted in Contra Costa County Superior Court in 2014 of possession	
23	of a controlled substance. She received a sentence of five years of probation. The California	
24	Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment, and the California Supreme Court denied a petitioner for	
25	review. The instant petition followed.	
26		ANALYSIS
27	A. STANDARD OF REVIEW	
28	This court may entertain a petition	n for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in
	custody pursuant to the judgment of a St	ate court only on the ground that he is in custody in

violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. 2254(a); Rose

v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading requirements. McFarland v. Scott, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court must "specify all the grounds for relief which are available to the petitioner ... and shall set forth in summary form the facts supporting each of the grounds thus specified." Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. 2254. "[N]otice' pleading is not sufficient, for the petition is expected to state facts that point to a 'real possibility of constitutional error." Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting Aubut v. Maine, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970)).

B. LEGAL CLAIMS

Petitioner claims that: (1) there was insufficient evidence that the pills found in her possession were a controlled substance; and (2) hearsay evidence was admitted from a website in violation of her rights under the Confrontation Clause. These claims are cognizable and warrant a response.

CONCLUSION

- 1. The clerk shall mail a copy of this order and the petition with all attachments to the respondent and the respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on the petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within **sixty-three** (63) **days** of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted based on the claim found cognizable herein. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state prison disciplinary proceedings that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, she shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within **twenty-eight days** of the date the answer is filed.

3. Respondent may file, within **sixty-three (63) days**, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the

Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within **twenty-eight days** of the date the motion is filed, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fourteen days** of the date any opposition is filed.

- 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
 - 5. Leave to proceed in forma pauperis is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE